Gary,

10/10/70

This is my Bud-memo day! Feeling weary and not like working, with the book I'm reading (Newman's) real ugh, my mind wanders. A little while ago I had to go to the drug store for medicinebefore they close for the weekend. Driving, I had a chance to think some more. A few more pieces of the puzzle may have come out of the recesses of the mind and I got a real far-out notion.

Quite some time ago I returned to Bud a partly-confidential file he had asked me to go over long ago. When he never came to go over it with me, I returned it. Much of it was of no value, and the best was not confidential. There was but a single significant documents properly confidential. I asked him for copies of the non-confidential material, many, many names, for Jim and Paul, chiefly Jim, to run through, and for a copy of the confidential to paraphrase. He agreed. I then, without his suggesting it, said I'd show him the paraphrase before sending it, so he could be certain of its safety. Well, in well over a month, probably two or more, hehasn't done it. Now there is nothing in this for me and there is a high probability Jim would find something valuable. I know there is in it what Paul can use. Of course, I know the contents anyway. There is quite a good likelihood this material could fill in some missing links in N.O.

Bud was real upset about that Exhibit 710 bit. He has a guy named Smith volunteering. Bud protested that Simmons had told Smith "nobody has ever seen Exhibit 710". Almost indignant.

As I thought how more and more this looks like a variation on a sick theme by Garrison, it suddenly struck me that he may have a special role for Flammonde. I begin with the assumption that Flammonde's incompetences is close to unique. The closest he could come to investigating Macy's is to find Gimbels. Why, then, would Bud have him investigating the Ray case? Why, not to investigate it, to go through the motions and have nothing. Why would he deny it, as he did twice, and then denied denying? I got to thinking about Flammonde's "unauthorized" account of Garrison's "investigation" and it seemed likely that provides the clue. Any guy who would call that sycophancy "unauthorized" is just the guy to write the unofficial account of Bud's derring do. He is the unofficial, official biographer of the genius who does it all. Like getting Ray a trial, after Foreman, etc. Far out, sure, but more likely than his being an "investigator". He couldn't even steal without Norden's help. Why take him to England, with his having no competence?

He did a strange thing on Davison. I'd asked him to get the clippings from the morgues of the Atlanta papers, where he had said he has connections. He got some. One referred to a clipping not included, so I asked him to get that. I had told him the story, in confidence, and told him there was much to do before I was ready to try and talk to D (you may recall my letters with Paul on this). Next thing I knew he blurted out that Davison had said there was nothing to it. How did he know? He had sent a retired government flatfoot down to question him. No doubt expecting that before an ignorant man D would have fallen all over himself to confess something? As I told him then, he had blown it. Wrongly, needlessly and, although I didn't say that either, unethically. Telling him he'd blown it was enough, for it was true. I think he resented it and he appears to have no capacity for learning. But this is, I think, a sample of his lust for coming up with something he can make out is his own. It galls him, I think. There are other little things of this character, all in the samepattern. But the thing I wanted to note, for I'm getting more forgetful with increasing weariness, is this conjecture on the probably secret role in which he has cast Flammonde. After all, what does one do with a whore?

Sincerely,